Page 9 Serial No. 10/652,047 Response to Final Official Action

Remarks

The present application has been reviewed in light of the Final Office Action mailed December 13, 2005. By the foregoing amendments, claims 14-16 have been amended. Claims 1-16 are pending in this application. No new matter is introduced by the amendments. Supports for the amendments can be found throughout the specification, claims, and drawings of the original application.

In compliance with the Examiner's requirement for submission of certified copies of the foreign priority documents, Applicant hereby encloses certified copies of the two Korean priority documents for perfection of the priority claims.

Applicant respectfully acknowledges and thanks the Examiner for her indication of allowance of claims 1-13, along with the statement of reasons for the allowance, in consideration of the previous response of Applicant mailed September 26, 2005.

In the present Office Action, the Examiner has objected to the previous amendment of Applicant under 35 U.S.C. 132(a) because the amendment introduces new matter into the disclosure. In particular, the Examiner has indicated that the alternative recitation "at least one of" (in the previously-amended claim 16) is not supported by the original disclosure. In addition, the Examiner has rejected claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement for the same reason that the alternative recitation "at least one of" in claim 16 is not supported by the original disclosure. The Examiner also added a detailed reasoning as to why the original disclosure might be insufficient to support the alternative recitation in claim 16. Accordingly, claim 16 is amended by the foregoing amendments in order to obviate this objection and rejection.

Page 10 Serial No. 10/652,047 Response to Final Official Action

The Examiner has rejected claims 14-16 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. In particular, the Examiner has stated that the recitation "said comparing" at line 3 of each of claims 14 and 15 is indefinite because there are two comparing steps recited in such claims. Claim 16 stands rejected for the similar reasons discussed above. Accordingly, claims 14-16 are carefully reviewed and amended by the foregoing amendments according to the Examiner's suggestions and also to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 14-16 are now in condition satisfying the requirements under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

Accordingly, in view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that all of the claims currently pending in this application (i.e., claims 1-16) are in condition for allowance. Early notice to that effect is earnestly requested.

Respectfully submitted,

January <u>23</u>, 2006

Wesley W. Whitmyer, Jr., Registration No. 33,558 Hyun Jong Park, Limited Recognition No. L0076

Attorneys for Applicant

ST.ONGE STEWARD JOHNSTON & REENS LLC

986 Bedford Street

Stamford, CT 06905-5619

203 324-6155